DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 264 CG 031 921

AUTHOR	Mayton, Daniel M., II; Weedman, Jonathon; Sonnen, Jennifer; Grubb, Celeste; Hirose, Masa
TITLE	The Teenage Nonviolence Test: Internal Consistency and Stability.
PUB DATE	1999-08-00
NOTE	29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (107th, Boston, MA, August 20-24, 1999). For a related paper oon "The Teenage Nonviolence Test," see CG 031 922.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adolescents; *Affective Measures; Factor Structure; Personality Measures; *Psychometrics; Test Reliability; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS	*Nonviolence

ABSTRACT

This research study was designed to establish the reliability of the Teenage Nonviolence Test (TNT). The consistency and factor structure of the TNT using a sample of 376 adolescents were evaluated. The stability of the TNT was assessed over time by administering the TNT twice with a two week intervening interval to 87 adolescents. The TNT appears to be a reliable measure of nonviolent tendencies among teenagers. An appendix presents a copy of the test instrument. (Contains 21 references and 9 tables.) (Author/GCP)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 264

The Teenage Nonviolence Test: Internal Consistency and Stability

Daniel M. Mayton II Jonathon Weedman Jennifer Sonnen
Celeste Grubb Masa Hirose

Lewis-Clark State College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. MAYTON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Paper presented at the 107th annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Ma, USA, August 21, 1999.
Requests for reprints can be made to the Department of Psychology, Lewis-Clark State College, Lewiston, Idaho, 83501, U.S.A. or through InterNet (dmayton @ lcsc.edu).

CG031921

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This research study was designed to establish the reliability of the Teenage Nonviolence Test (TNT). We evaluated the internal consistency and factor structure of the TNT using a sample of 376 adolescents. We assessed the stability of the TNT over time by administering the TNT twice with a two week intervening interval to 87 adolescents. The TNT appears to be a reliable measure of nonviolent tendencies among teenagers.

The Teenage Nonviolence Test:
Internal Structure and Reliability

> "It was a phone call that will stay with Denver Police Officer John Lietz for the rest of his life. He picked up the line to hear the voice of Matthew Depew who was trapped in a storage room off the school cafeteria. Several times Lietz heard shooters trying to break into the room. At one point as they pounded on the door, Depew calmly told Lietz that he was sure that he was going to die. 'Please tell my father that I love him.' " (Glick et al., 1999, p. 24)

This is not a scene from a popular horror flick but one of several incidents that have occurred in schools through out the United States. This scene was from Columbine High School where two boys drew fire and killed twelve students, a teacher, and then themselves. Unfortunately this is not an isolated occurrence. In Pearl, Mississippi on October of 1997, a 16-year-old shot nine students, killing two plus he killed his mother with a knife. In December of 1997, a 14-year-old killed three of his classmates and wounded five more in West Paducah, Kentucky. In April of 1998, Jonesboro, Arkansas was the battle ground for two boys, just eleven and thirteen, on a rampage. Again in May of 1998, shots were fired in a high school cafeteria in Springfield, Oregon and in a matter of minutes several teenagers were killed and many others injured. The perpetrator of this crime was a quiet high school freshman.

These killings are horrific enough but general statistics

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

regarding teenage crime and violence are also rising. Crime arrests of perpetrators under the age of 18 increased sixty-seven percent from 1986 to 1995 (Cowles Business Media, 1996). In addition, between 1982 and 1992 the number of arrests of 13-15 year olds nearly doubled. More murders are committed by 18 year olds than any other age group (McNultry, 1995). Why are adolescents committing these violent acts and what can be done to prevent more killings and curb the violence?

Measuring Violence

Research on making, identifying, and testing assessment tools for violent behavior is somewhat limited. One goal of assessing violent behavior is determining the factors that cause people to act violently. Another goal is to identify any tell-tale signs to help us predict violent behavior. Most research on the subject has focused on family or marital violence (Campbell & Humphreys, 1984; Strauss, 1993). Tilly (1969) notes that there is no one theory that can account for all acts of violence although the assessment of violence can be broken into two main ideas of thought. Clinical researchers "examine and compare the internal structures and sequences of distinct cases of collective violence" (Tilly, 1969, p. 16). This type of research is concerned with the act itself and how it came to be. Of secondary importance, is the violence itself. Most research on violence is epidemiological and it "examines the incidence of different types of collective violence in terms of time, place, and people involved" (Tilly, 1969, p. 16). The problems encountered with epidemiological studies involve the definitions of violence and its subsequent documentation. How the researcher defines violence will greatly

effect any results yielded. If violence is identified as physical abuse, for example, all emotional or psychological violence will be absent from the study. Finally, accurate documentation of the violent event is problematic. The events "are ordinarily fragmentary, highly selective, and subject to considerable distortion" (Tilly, 1969, p. 19).

As a result of the complexity of violence research, few assessment tools are available that completely assess violent behavior. In 1979, Strauss developed the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) and later in 1993 added a checklist to the CTS to identify important cases of violent activity. The CTS helps to identify the severity and chronicity of domestic assault to determine if criminal justice intervention is necessary. Reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical aggression or violence make up the three scales of the instrument. The violence component is then subdivided into minor, severe, and high risk violence.

Campbell and Humphreys (1984) developed a checklist primarily for nurses who need to assess family violence for their patients. The checklist is concerned with family structure, family resources, family roles, family boundaries, family communication patterns, family conflict resolution patterns, family power distribution, family values, emotional climate, division of labor, support systems, development stages, stressors, socialization of children, intrafamily relationships, perception of family well-being, and health history to determine several different aspects of violence. They suggest that a genogram of past family violence be developed along with a physical examination to help determine if there currently is violence within in the family. Each

subsection of the checklist has a list of high risk responses to alert the interviewer of possible violence.

Another component of violence is aggression. The assessment of aggression is just as opaque as those tools used for violence. One of the better scales of aggression is the Aggression Questionnaire developed by Buss and Perry (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire assesses aggression on four scales: physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility. The entire questionnaire consists of twenty nine questions. An example of an item from the physical aggression scale is "If somebody hits me, I hit back." (Buss & Perry, 1992, p. 454).

Measuring Nonviolence

With the rise of violent teenage crimes, an instrument that measures nonviolent tendencies would be very useful. Research on developing assessment tools for nonviolent behavior is quite rare. Mayton and Palmer (1996) conducted a review of PsycLit to identify measures of nonviolence and found none specifically designed for teenagers. Because of the absence of a suitable measure for teenagers, Mayton et al. (1998) created the Teenage Nonviolence Test.

The Teenage Nonviolence Test

The Teenage Nonviolence Test (TNT, Mayton et al., 1998) is based on the philosophy of Mohandas K. Gandhi who championed nonviolence and civil disobedience in South Africa and India (Bondurant, 1965; Bose, 1987; Nakhre, 1982; Pelton, 1974). Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolence centered around the use of *ahimsa*, which refers to an absence of violence or a nonviolent

action. *Ahimsa* might be either physical or psychological in nature. *Ahimsa* or nonviolence is positive love and "Gandhi underscores creativity and reconstruction as essential in satyagraha inter-personal relationship as important and urgent" (Bose, 1987, p. 20). Another major component of philosophy of nonviolence is *satyagraha*. This is the combination of the Indian words *satya* (truth-love) and *agraha* (firmness/force). It is "the vindication of truth not by infliction of suffering on others but on one's self" (Civil Disobedience, 1999, p. 2). Bose (1987) says that *satyagraha's* main goal is the "welfare and good of all, a fuller and richer concept of people's democracy than any we have yet known" (p. 16). This method is used to help open the road to the terminal goal of peace. Violence and other forms of negative resistance only provide road blocks to this objective. Therefore, nonviolence is the Gandhian belief that a person does not have to become violent in order to produce social change. From this point of view ". . . nonviolence is an active positive force. A willingness to accept suffering, but not inflict it on others. A friendly, open, caring attitude towards allies and opponents alike." (Ryan, 1996, p. 2).

The TNT contains 55 Likert items which were developed to assess six subscales. Respondents indicate whether each statement is definitely true, probably true, probably not true, or definitely not true for them. The first three subscales were based upon the work of Elliott (1980). The labels and general focus of each subscale are as follows:

(1) physical nonviolence (16 items)

- the conscious rejection of behaviors or the threat of

behaviors intended to inflict bodily injury on another person in an attempt to coerce, curtail, or eliminate their behavior in favor of alternate forms of conflict resolution,

(2) psychological nonviolence (16 items)

- the conscious rejection of behaviors or the threat of behaviors intended to humiliate, intimidate, or in other ways demean the human dignity of another person or group in and attempt to coerce, curtail, or eliminate their behavior in favor of alternate forms of conflict resolution

(3) active value orientation (4 items)

- the willingness to perform behaviors designed to achieve a situation commensurate with one's own norms, values, and goals

The fourth subscale was based on the writings on nonviolence of Kool (1990).

(4) empathy and helping (5 items)

- assisting others in minor levels of need

The last two subscales were based more specifically on Gandhian principles. These are

(5) satyagraha (10 items)

- the active search for wisdom and the willingness to change his or her conception of truth

(6) tapasya (4 items)

- the willingness to endure hardship or suffering rather than to inflict harm on others

The most nonviolent response for each item on the TNT is coded as a four, the next most nonviolent response is coded as a three, the next most nonviolent response is coded as a two, and the least nonviolent response is coded as a one for analysis purposes. Subscale scores are computed by summing the scores for each item in the subscale and dividing by the number of items in the subscale. Therefore, scores above 2.5 are indicative of nonviolent tendencies and those below 2.5 are indicative of more violent tendencies.

The TNT was designed to be used by psychologists and other mental health professionals to assess the need for intervention and the impact of interventions for their clients. While the TNT seems like a promising instrument, only limited psychometric data is available and more research is needed (Mayton et al., 1998). In this research study we were interested in establishing the reliability of the TNT. More specifically, we wanted to evaluate the internal consistency of the subscales and to assess the stability of the TNT over time using the test-retest method.

METHOD

Internal Consistency

Participants

The sample for this study included 376 adolescents attending a public Junior High School in Lewiston, Idaho. An approximate equal number of males (50.8%) and females (49.2%) were in the sample. Most of the respondents were eighth graders (40.7%) while seventh and ninth graders made up 23.1% and 36.2% of the sample,

respectively. The mean age of the respondents was 13.47 with a standard deviation of .913. The students were predominantly Caucasian (86.4%) with 5.7% being Latino/Hispanic and 2.2% being Native-American Indian.

Procedure

The principal in the school was contacted and a request was made to the teachers to administer the TNT to students in selected classes. The teachers administered the TNT themselves to their classes and those students who volunteered to participate completed them anonymously during class time. The TNT was part of a longer questionnaire which took approximately 25 to 40 minutes to complete. This research was conducted in November and early December of 1998.

Test-Retest Reliability

Participants

The sample for this study included 87 adolescents attending a different public Junior High School in Lewiston, Idaho. Males made up 55.8% of the sample and females made up 44.2%. Seventh, eighth, and ninth grades made up 23.3%, 48.8%, and 27.9% of the sample, respectively. The students were predominantly Caucasian (89.4%) with the largest minority group being Native-American Indians (5.9%).

Procedure

The principal in the school was contacted and a request was made to distribute the TNT to the teachers to administer the TNT to students in selected classes. The teachers administered the TNT themselves to their classes and those students who volunteered to participate completed them during class time. The TNT took

approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Between ten and fifteen days later the same students completed the TNT again. Since the respondents placed an identification number of their choice on the completed TNTs the first and second administrations could be paired. This research was conducted in November and December of 1998. Participation was voluntary and the results were kept confidential.

RESULTS

Internal Consistency

The means and standard deviations for each item plus the item-total correlations for each subscale are presented in Tables 1 through 6. Alpha coefficients were computed for each subscale for the entire sample. These are also presented in Tables 1 through 6. The alpha coefficients appear to be adequate for five of the six subscales. The alpha coefficients ranged from a high of .904 on the physical nonviolence subscale to a low of .772 on the adequate subscales. The active value orientation subscale only had an alpha of .322 which is problematic.

Insert Tables 1 to 6 About Here

Alpha coefficients were also calculated for males and females separately and are presented in Table 7. Similar patterns were identified for these analyses as were found for the total sample. All of the six subscales were identified to be internally consistent except the active value orientation subscale.

Insert Table 7 About Here

Test-Retest Reliability

Test-retest reliability coefficients for the total sample are presented in Table 8. Separate test-retest coefficients for males and females are also presented in Table 8 and separate analyses by grade level are presented in Table 9. The values of the test-retest coefficients appear to be quite adequate for nonviolence research on groups of teenagers with one exception. The active value orientation subscale was again deficient.

Insert Tables 8 and 9 About Here

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Five of the six subscales of the TNT appear to be internally consistent and stable for junior high age teenagers. Future research is needed to determine the reliability of the TNT with older teenagers as well as to determine the validity of the TNT.

The TNT was designed to be used by school personnel and psychologists to determine the impact of violence prevention programs within their school buildings or districts. The results of this study indicate the TNT may be such a tool.

References

Bondurant, J. V. (1965). The Gandhian philosophy of conflict (Rev. Ed.). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bose, A. (1987). Dimensions of peace and nonviolence: The Gandhian perspective. Delhi: Gian Publishing House.

Buss, A.H. & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 452-458.

Campbell, J. & Humphreys, J. (1984). Nursing care of victims of family violence. Reston, VA: Reston Publishing Company Inc.

Civil disobedience - Philosophy: Mahatma Gandhi. (1999). [On-Line] available: http://www.kids-right.org/gandhi.htm

Conant, R.W. & Apple-Levin, M. (1969). Problems in research on community violence. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger.

Cowles Business Media. (1996, December). Teenage crime wave could worsen. [On-Line]. Available: http://demographics.com/Publications/FC/96_FC/9612_FC/9612f04a.htm

Elliott, G. C. (1980). Components of pacifism. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 24, 27-54.

Glick, D., Keene-Osborn, S., Gegax, T., Bai, M., & Clemetson, L. (1999, May 3). Anatomy of a massacre. Newsweek, 133, 18.

Kool, V. K. (Ed.) (1990). Perspectives on nonviolence. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Mayton, D. M., Diessner R., & Granby C. A. (1996). Nonviolence and values: Empirical support for theoretical relationships. Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology.

Mayton, D. M., Nogle, K. S., Mack, J. L., Maxcy, R. T., Weeks, R. G., Hamilton, D. L., Morton, C. M., Mineshita, T. &

Nawata, A. (1998, August). Teenage Nonviolence Test: A new measure of nonviolence. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, August, 1998, San Francisco, CA, USA.

Mayton, D. M. & Palmer, J. (1996, July). The measurement of nonviolence. A paper presented at the meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 415 145)

McNultry, P. (1995, Winter). Natural born killers? Preventing the coming explosion of teenage crime. Policy Review.

Nakhre, A. W. (1982). Social psychology of nonviolent action: A study of three satyagrahas. Delhi, India: Chanakya Publications.

Pelton, L. H. (1974). The psychology of nonviolence. New York: Pergamon Press.

Ryan, H. (1996). The nonviolent philosophy. [On-Line] available: http://www. netwood.net/~hryan/nonviol.htm

Strauss, M.A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactic (CT) scales. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 75-87.

Strauss, M.A. (1993). Identifying offenders in criminal justice research on domestic assault. American Behavioral Scientist, 36(5), 587-600.

Tilly (1969) in R. W. Conant & M. Apple-Levin Problems in research on community violence. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger.

Table 1

Physical Nonviolence Scale	Mean	Stan Dev	Item-total Correlation
5. If someone insulted me in front of my friends, I would smack them.	2.91	0.92	0.65
12. I don't get mad, I get even. *	2.42	0.91	0.66
17. Everyone has the right to injure another to protect their property.*	2.66	1.02	0.56
18. If someone gets in my face, I push them away. *	2.05	0.91	0.66
24. Violence on television bothers me.	1.71	0.86	0.47
26. I won't fight if people call me names.	2.62	1.04	0.45
28. If someone shoves me in the hall, I would just keep walking.	2.42	0.97	0.68
31. I have been known to pick fights.*	3.24	0.88	0.60
36. If someone cuts in front of me in the cafeteria, I shove them out of line.*	2.51	0.99	0.57
40. If someone pushes me, I push them back.*	2.26	0.94	0.72
41. I sometimes bring weapons to school.*	3.82	0.53	0.36
43. It is okay to carry weapons on the street.*	3.32	0.90	0.53
44. If someone spit on me, I would hit them.*	2.13	1.03	0.66
46. I don't like to watch people fight.	2.21	1.05	0.52
47. It is often necessary to use violence to prevent violence. *	2.78	0.96	0.55
53. A good way to get me to fight is to tease me.*	2.96	0.93	0.59
			Alpha = 0.904

* not true indicates nonviolent response

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Psychological Nonviolence Scale	Mean	Stan Dev	Item-total Correlation
1. Reasoning helps me avoid fights.	2.88	0.79	0.52
3. When someone is rude to me, I am rude back.*	2.24	0.82	0.51
6. Yelling at someone makes them understand me.*	3.04	0.76	0.47
8. Some people respect me because they fear me.*	3.06	0.88	0.55
14. Sometimes I make fun of others to their face.*	2.71	0.84	0.66
19. I can scare people into doing things for me.*	3.17	0.76	0.56
22. I like the look of defeat on people's faces when I beat them in competition.*	2.41	1.03	0.56
25. I don't like to make fun of people.	2.57	0.88	0.42
29. I often call people names when they make me angry.*	2.36	0.81	0.59
34. I humiliate people who make me feel bad.*	2.76	0.88	0.72
38. When someone calls me a name, I ignore it.	2.56	0.90	0.57
39. I like to laugh when others make mistakes.*	2.52	0.83	0.62
48. If someone disagrees with me, I tell them they are stupid. *	2.99	0.84	0.57
49. I enjoy saying things that upset teachers.*	3.37	0.80	0.57
50. Starting a nasty rumor is a good way to get back at someone.*	3.08	0.98	0.66
55. I tease people I don't like.*	2.70	0.93	0.68
		Alpha =	0.863

* not true indicates nonviolent response

Table 3

Active Value Orientation Items	Mean	Stan Dev	Item-total Correlation
4. If people talk the talk, they should walk the walk.	3.13	0.96	0.11
7. I'll argue for what I believe despite what others say.	3.25	0.71	0.21
30. I try to what I say I am going to do.	3.19	0.58	0.22
37. My action can influence others.	3.84	1.02	0.07
		Alpha =	0.322

Table 4

Helping/Empathy items	Mean	Stan Dev	Item-total Correlation
9. If someone dropped their books, I'd help them pick them up.	2.89	0.87	0.64
11. I'd give the person in front of me my extra change, if they didn't have enough for lunch.	3.01	1.13	0.64
13. I try to tell people when they do a good job.	3.07	0.97	0.66
16. I like helping new students find their classes.	2.57	0.87	0.53
32. I would give up my seat on the bus to someone else.	2.25	0.94	0.48
		Alpha =	0.801

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

Satyagraha Items	Mean	Stan Dev	Item-total Correlation
2. I am open-minded.	3.15	0.64	0.34
10. Life is what you learn from it.	3.23	0.68	0.31
15. I try to learn from others' mistakes.	3.06	0.72	0.51
21. When I am arguing with someone, I always try to see their side.	2.64	0.82	0.55
23. I often do things without having good reason. *	2.42	0.79	0.30
27. I attempt to learn from all my experiences.	3.22	0.67	0.51
33. I don't pay attention to people with different opinions. *	3.10	0.77	0.38
35. I often think about developing the best plan for the future.	2.91	0.86	0.42
42. I try to make decisions by looking at all the available information.	2.97	0.72	0.60
52. If I can find out why people are arguing, I can help them solve their problems.	2.50	0.85	0.46
		Alpha =	0.772

* not true indicates nonviolent response

Table 6

Tapasya Items	Mean	Stan Dev	Item-total Correlation
20. I would let my friend buy the last shirt in a store even if I wanted it a lot.	2.73	0.91	0.58
45. If there was only one dessert left, I would let my friend eat it even if I really wanted it.	2.69	0.96	0.64
51. I'd give up my coat if a friend was cold.	2.78	0.89	0.48
54. If my friend and I both wanted the same shoes in a store, I would let my friend buy them.	2.45	0.93	0.62
		Alpha =	0.776

Table 7

	Alpha Coefficients	
TNT Subscales	Males	Females
Physical Nonviolence	.901	.877
Psychological Nonviolence	.853	.838
Active Value Orientation	.397	.193
Helping/Empathy	.733	.811
Satyagraha	.775	.754
Tapasya	.782	.756

Table 8

TNT Subscales	Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients		
	Males (n=46)	Females (n=38)	Total (n=84)
Physical Nonviolence	.868	.872	.880
Psychological Nonviolence	.701	.866	.795
Active Value Orientation	.483	.464	.477
Helping/Empathy	.711	.863	.789
Satyagraha	.833	.800	.818
Tapasya	.608	.697	.645

Table 9

TNT Subscales	Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients		
	Seventh Grade	Eighth Grade	Ninth Grade
Physical Nonviolence	.928	.811	.924
Psychological Nonviolence	.916	.761	.762
Active Value Orientation	.583	.618	.272
Helping/Empathy	.865	.766	.805
Satyagraha	.938	.753	.790
Tapasya	.858	.492	.707

APPENDIX

Social and Personal Opinion Survey

This is a scientific study of attitudes and opinions. This is a chance to look at yourself and see how you feel about things. Be sure that your answers show **how YOU feel** about each statements. **PLEASE DO NOT TALK ABOUT THE STATEMENTS OR YOUR ANSWERS WITH ANYONE ELSE.** We will keep your answers private and not show them to your teachers, principal, parents, or anyone else.

Please read each statement and decide whether it is true or not for you. Circle the response which best describes how you feel about the statement. If the statement is definitely true or nearly always true for you, circle the response "definitely true for me". If the statement is generally true for you but not always true, circle the response "usually true for me". If the statement is occasionally true for you but generally not true, circle the response "usually not true for me". If the statement is definitely false or nearly always not true for you circle the response "definitely not true for me".

If you have any questions raise your hand. Once you have started, **PLEASE DO NOT SAY YOUR ANSWERS OUT LOUD OR TALK.**

1. Reasoning helps me avoid fights.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

2. I am open minded.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

3. When someone is rude to me, I am rude back.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

4. If people talk the talk, they should walk the walk.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

5. If someone insulted me in front of my friends, I would smack them.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

6. Yelling at someone makes them understand me.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

7. I'll argue for what I believe despite what others say.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

8. Some people respect me because they fear me.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

9. If someone dropped their books, I'd help them pick them up.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

10. Life is what you learn from it.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

11. I'd give the person in front of me my extra change if they didn't have enough for lunch.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

12. I don't get mad, I get even.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

13. I try to tell people when they do a good job.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

14. Sometimes I make fun of others to their face.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

15. I try to learn from others mistakes.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

16. I like helping new students find their classes.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

17. Everyone has the right to injure another to protect their property.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

18. If someone got in my face, I'd push them away.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

19. I can scare people into doing things for me.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

20. I would let my friend buy the last shirt in a store even if I wanted it a lot.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

21. When I am arguing with someone, I always try to see their side of it.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

22. I like the look of defeat on people's faces when I beat them in competition.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

23. I often do things without having a good reason.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

24. Violence on television bothers me.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

25. I don't like to make fun of people.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

26. I won't fight if people call me names.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

27. I attempt to learn from all my experiences.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

28. If someone shoves me in the hall, I would just keep walking.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

29. I often call people names when they make me angry.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

30. I try to do what I say I am going to do.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

31. I have been known to pick fights.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

32. I would give up my seat on the bus for someone else.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

33. I don't pay attention to people with different opinions.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

34. I humiliate people who make me feel bad.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

35. I often think about developing the best plan for the future.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

36. If someone cuts in front of me in the cafeteria, I want to shove them out of line.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

37. My actions can influence others.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

38. When someone calls me a name, I ignore it.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

39. I like to laugh when others make mistakes.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

40. If someone pushes me, I push them back.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

41. I sometimes bring weapons to school.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

42. I try to make decisions by looking at all the available information.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

43. It is ok to carry weapons on the street.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

44. If someone spit on me, I would hit them.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

45. If there was only one dessert left, I would let my friend eat it even if I really wanted it.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

46. I don't like to watch people fight.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

47. It is often necessary to use violence to prevent violence.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

48. If someone disagrees with me, I tell them they are stupid.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

49. I enjoy saying things that upset my teachers.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

50. Starting a nasty rumor is a good way to get back at someone.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

51. I'd give up my coat if a friend was cold.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

52. If I can find out why people are arguing, I can help them solve their problem.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

53. Sometimes people get me to fight by teasing me.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

54. If my friend and I both wanted the same pair of shoes in a store, I would let them buy it and do without.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

55. I tease people I don't like.

definitely true for me	usually true for me	usually not true for me	definitely not true for me

The following questions are for statistical analyses only.

1. Circle one. Male Female

2. Ethnic background: Circle one.
   Asian Black/African American Hispanic/Latino/Mexican/American
   Native American Indian White/Caucasian Other (Specify_____)

3. What is your age?_____

4. Circle your current grade in school:
   6th Grade 7th Grade 8th Grade 9th Grade 10th Grade 11 Grade 12th Grade
   Other (Specify_____)

5. Indicate the highest level of education your father completed._____
6. Indicate the highest level of education your mother completed._____

7. Indicate your household's current annual income:
   less than $10,000 $10,001-$20,000 $20,001-$35,000 $35,001-$50,000
   more than $50,000

8. Circle your religious affiliation:
   Catholic Jewish LDS Moslem Native Peoples (Specify_____)
   Protestant/Christian (Specify_____) Other (Specify_____)

Teenage Nonviolence Test (TNT) - SCORING KEY

Physical Nonviolence (alpha = .91)

- conscious rejection of all forms of physical violence in favor of alternate forms of conflict resolution (due to a professed moral or ethical belief structure)

[physical violence - behaviors or the threat of behaviors intended to inflict bodily injury on another person in an attempt to coerce, curtail, or eliminate their behavior]

5 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
12 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
17 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
18 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
24 Physical nonviolence - true nonviolent
26 Physical nonviolence - true nonviolent
28 Physical nonviolence - true nonviolent
31 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
36 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
40 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
41 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
43 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
44 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
46 Physical nonviolence - true nonviolent
47 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent
53 Physical nonviolence - not true nonviolent

Psychological nonviolence (alpha = .91)

- conscious rejection of all forms of psychological violence in favor of alternate forms of conflict resolution (due to a professed moral or ethical belief structure)

[psychological violence - behaviors or the threat of behaviors intended to humiliate, intimidate, or in other ways demean the human dignity of another person or group in and attempt to coerce, curtail, or eliminate their behavior]

1 Psychological nonviolence - true nonviolent
3 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
6 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
8 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
14 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
19 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
22 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
25 Psychological nonviolence - true nonviolent
29 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
34 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
38 Psychological nonviolence - true nonviolent
39 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
48 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
49 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
50 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent
55 Psychological nonviolence - not true nonviolent

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Active value orientation (alpha = .65)

- willingness to perform behaviors designed to achieve a situation commensurate with one's own norms, values, and goals

4 Active value orientation - true nonviolent (active)
7 Active value orientation - true nonviolent (active)
30 Active value orientation - true nonviolent (active)
37 Active value orientation - true nonviolent (active)

Helping/empathy (alpha = .78)

9 Helping/empathy - true nonviolent (prohelping)
11 Helping/empathy - true nonviolent (prohelping)
13 Helping/empathy - true nonviolent (prohelping)
16 Helping/empathy - true nonviolent (prohelping)
32 Helping/empathy - true nonviolent (prohelping)

Satyagraha (alpha = .75)

- active search for wisdom, because the truth is based upon the subjective perceptions of individuals, a person needs to be willing to change his or her conception of truth. [literally "holding on to the truth"]

2 Satyagraha - true nonviolent
10 Satyagraha - true nonviolent
15 Satyagraha - true nonviolent
21 Satyagraha - true nonviolent
23 Satyagraha - not true nonviolent
27 Satyagraha - true nonviolent
33 Satyagraha - not true nonviolent
35 Satyagraha - true nonviolent
42 Satyagraha - true nonviolent
52 Satyagraha - true nonviolent

Tapasya (alpha = .73)

- willingness to endure hardship or suffering rather than to inflict harm on others. [literally "self-suffering"]

20 Tapasya - true nonviolent
45 Tapasya - true nonviolent
51 Tapasya - true nonviolent
54 Tapasya - true nonviolent

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Teenage Nonviolence Test: Internal Consistency and Stability

Author(s): Daniel M Maynard II, Jonathan Woodman, Jennifer Sonnen, Celeste Grubb, Mase Hinica

Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to each document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified documents, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate these documents as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Daniel M Maynard II	Printed Name/Position/Title: Daniel M Maynard II, Professor
Organization/Address: Lewis-Clark State College	Telephone: 208-792-2280 FAX: 208-792-2820
	E-Mail Address: dmaynard@lcsc.edu Date: 9/13/02

APA [redacted] 99

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of these documents from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of these documents. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Counseling & Student Services
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
201 Ferguson Building
PO Box 26171
Greensboro, NC 27402-6171